

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/441,656

Applicant(s)

ELSEY ET AL.

Examiner

Hector A. Agdeppa

Art Unit

2642

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hector A. Agdeppa.

(3) Alex Yip.

(2) Jonathan Tyler.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: 2002/0078004 (Ambrosini et al.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the difference between the prior art and claimed invention as being the existence of an intermediary function acting between a directory assistance initiator and the actual directory assistance system. Examiner suggested drawing the claims to highlight this aspect of the claimed invention, wherein the intermediary function assumes the same access level as an initiator automatically or some level as function thereof. Such a limitation, if one could be developed, would overcome the prior art references presented thusfar.